

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/613,782	10/613,782 07/03/2003		Patrizio Mattei	21159	6985	
151	7590	06/06/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE INC.				TRUONG, TAN	TRUONG, TAMTHOM NGO	
PATENT LAW DEPARTMENT 340 KINGSLAND STREET NUTLEY, NJ 07110				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1624		

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)	Office Action Summ	ary Pa	art of Paper No./Mail Date 20050531	./0
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Revi  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-14- Paper No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	(PTO-413) ate Patent Application (PTO-152)	
a) All b) Some * c) None and Som	of: ority documents have be ority documents have be ories of the priority documents have be ories of the priority documents have be	en received. en received in Applicati nents have been receive ale 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a cl	aim for foreign priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. & 119/a	)-(d) or (f).	
9) The specification is objected to the specification is objected to the specification is objected to the specific speci	/are: a) accepted or lobjection to the drawing(s)	be held in abeyance. Se ired if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
7) Claim(s) 6,7,9,10 and 13 is/are 8) Claim(s) are subject to re Application Papers	objected to.	requirement.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-5,8,11,12 and 14-18</u>		onsideration.		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in				
Disposition of Claims				
closed in accordance with the p		• •		
3) Since this application is in cond	•		osecution as to the merits is	
1) Responsive to communication (s	s) filed on <u>30 <i>March 200</i></u> 2b)⊠ This action is			
Status				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMM  - Extensions of time may be available under the provafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this  - If the period for reply specified above is less than the seriod for reply is specified above, the maxim  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704	MUNICATION.  visions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no a communication.  hirty (30) days, a reply within the s num statutory period will apply and or reply will, by statute, cause the a conths after the mailing date of this	event, however, may a reply be tin atutory minimum of thirty (30) day will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from oplication to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Period for Reply	manicalion appears on t			
The MAILING DATE of this com		n N. Truong	1624	
Office Action Summar	Y Examin	er	Art Unit	
	10/613,	782	MATTEI ET AL.	
V	Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)	

Application/Control Number: 10/613,782

Art Unit: 1624

# Page 2

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's amendment of 3-30-05 has been fully considered. The amended claims and argument have overcome the previous rejections of 112/2<sup>nd</sup> and 102(a) based on **Breu et. al.** (WO'488), and thus, said rejections are withdrawn herein. However, they have not overcome the previous 103 rejection, which will be maintained herein.

And update search yields a new relevant prior art, which raises the following new ground of rejection.

Claims 1-18 are pending.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 1. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Hess** et. al. (US 3,511,836). On columns 25 and 26 of US'836, Table XXI lists several quinazoline compounds of the following formula:

$$\begin{array}{c|c} R_1 & & R_2 \\ \hline R_2 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Application/Control Number: 10/613,782 Page 3

Art Unit: 1624

Three compounds of said formula read on the instantly claimed formula I (see the first three compounds in Table XXI) with the following substituents:

- a. R<sup>1</sup> is OR<sup>4</sup>; R<sup>4</sup> is alkyl (i.e., R<sup>1</sup> is alkoxy);
- b.  $R^2$  is an amino;
- c.  $R^3$  is hydrogen (corresponds to the reference's  $R_5$ );
- d. Ring A is a 6-membered heterocycle substituted with hydroxy or alkoxy (i.e., hydroxy-piperidine, or alkoxy-piperidine).

The disclosed compounds can treat hypertension, and thus, can be incorporated in pharmaceutical composition as recited in the instant claim 14.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

Application/Control Number: 10/613,782

Art Unit: 1624

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 11, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hess et. al. (US'836).

As discussed in the rejection above, the three compounds in Table XXI read on the compounds recited in the instant claims 1, 4, 5. However, they differ from those recited in the instant claims 11 and 12 by not having a *pyrrolidinyl* ring at the 4<sup>th</sup> position on the quinazoline ring. However, Table III shows the 16<sup>th</sup> compound as a quinazoline compound having a *pyrrolidinyl* ring at the 4<sup>th</sup> position, and the 18<sup>th</sup> compound with analogous substituents, but having a *piperidino* at the 4<sup>th</sup> position. Thus, there is equivalent teaching for *pyrrolidinyl* and *piperidino* ring at the 4<sup>th</sup> position on the quinazolinyl ring. Therefore, one of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to modify the compounds in Table XXI by replacing the *piperidino* ring with *pyrrolidinyl* ring to obtain the compounds recited in the instant claims 11 and 12.

Thus, at the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to make and use the compounds recited in the above claims in view of the equivalent teaching provided by Hess et. al.

3. Claims 1-4, 8, 11, 12 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Breu et. al.** (WO 02/20488 A2).

On page 11, Breu et. al. list several quinazoline compounds, two of which (e.g., compounds on lines 13 & 14) are analogous to compounds of the instant formula I with the following substituents:

- a. Ring A is pyrrolidinyl or piperidinyl;
- b.  $R^1$  is  $-N(R^5)(R^6)$  wherein  $R^5$  and  $R^6$  together with the N atom to which they are attached form a 6-membered heterocyclic ring such as *pyridine* or *pyrimidine*;
- c. R<sup>2</sup> is an alkyl group (or methyl);
- d. R<sup>3</sup> is hydrogen.

The disclosed compounds differ from the claimed compounds by not having the *pyridinyl* or *pyrimidinyl* bonded to the quinazolinyl ring via the ring N. However, the preferred embodiment on page 8 of WO'488 lists several rings represented by R<sup>3</sup> in which the *pyridinyl* and *pyrimidinyl* are not limited to a particular point of attachment. In other words, Breu et. al. seem to suggest an equivalent teaching for all points of attachment of those rings. Therefore, one would presume that the bonding of said rings to the quinazolinyl ring via N would still maintain the same biological activity.

The disclosed compounds can also treat obesity, and can also be given with *orlistat* simultaneously, separately or sequentially. Hence, the composition and method claims 14, 15 and 18 are also rendered obvious by Breu et. al.

The instant claims 16 and 17 recite a method of treating obesity using a combination of the compounds claimed herein and *orlistat* (60-720 mg per day). Although Breu does not

Application/Control Number: 10/613,782 Page 6

Art Unit: 1624

disclose the specific dosage of *orlistat*, said dosage would have been within the level of a skilled clinician to figure out since *orlistat* is a commercially available agent with an established dosage.

Thus, at the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to make and use some compounds of the instantly claimed formula I in view of the teaching of Breu et. al.

## Claim Objections

4. Claims 6, 7, 9, 10 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 6 and 7 recite subgenera of formula (I) wherein R<sup>1</sup> is OR<sup>4</sup>, and R<sup>4</sup> is not an alkyl group (i.e., R<sup>1</sup> is not an alkoxy group), which is not taught by either Breu et. al. or Hess et. al. Claims 9 and 10 recite subgenera of formula (I) wherein R<sup>1</sup> is – NR<sup>5</sup>R<sup>6</sup> with R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>6</sup> as independent substituents, which is not taught or fairly suggested by Breu et. al. or Hess et. al. Similarly, claim 13 recites specific compounds of R<sup>1</sup> as OR<sup>4</sup> or NR<sup>5</sup>R<sup>6</sup> wherein R<sup>4</sup>-R<sup>6</sup> are all independent substituents. Said compounds are not taught or fairly suggested by Breu et. al. or Hess et. al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamthom N. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-0676. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10:00-6:30).

Art Unit: 1624

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tamthom N. Truong

Examiner

Art Unit 1624

\*\*\*

5-31-05

JAMES O. WILSON

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600